

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1903.

## NOW DEBATING AGAINST TIME.

Opposition Threaten to Use Up  
All Next Week.

### THE GAMEY CHARGES STILL

Mr. Sam. Clarke's Light-veined  
Speech.

Mr. H. Carscallen and Mr. W. J.  
Hanna Also Speak—Quiet Day in  
the Legislature.

Interest has waned in the long debate in the Legislature on the motion to refer the Gamey charges to a commission. The galleries yesterday were not so crowded, and the speeches, while far from uninteresting, lacked the zest which accompanies an attack on a new subject. The indications point to a discussion lasting well into next week, if not to the end, by which time the Opposition, who are doing most of the talking, will have exhausted both their speakers and their ammunition. Yesterday Mr. Henry Carscallen presented the Conservative arguments in a speech of an hour's duration. Mr. Sam. Clarke followed, giving the first real touches of humor which have lightened this otherwise weighty discussion. The last speaker of the day was Mr. W. J. Hanna, of

whom the Conservatives expect so much, and who did not conclude his speech.

### Praise for the Governor.

Mr. Henry Carscallen (East Hamilton), who resumed the debate immediately upon the opening of the House, first expressed regret at the absence at the opening of the Lieutenant-Governor. He was sure the people of the whole Province would extend to him their sympathy in his present position. Everyone would have been glad if he could have been present. He was sure the wish of the people of Ontario was that nothing should be said or done to mar his illustrious career or to disturb the comfort and repose of his declining years. Proceeding, he said much had been said in the present discussion which was wide of the mark, and he thought the House and the country should suspend judgment until the whole case had been heard. (Ministerial applause.) The country owed a debt of gratitude to the member for Manitoulin (Mr. Gamey) for his efforts to expose, as he had done, the men who sought to dishonor him, at the sacrifice of enduring insult and ignominy. Mr. Carscallen proceeded to review the incidents following the general election, and said that the Government must have known that an army of election crooks were prowling about the country, personating and doing all sorts of election wrongs in their behalf. Therefore there was no one but themselves to blame, and they could not shirk the responsibility. Although he agreed with the Attorney-General, that much depended upon the Crown Attorneys, yet the Government had not done their duty in prosecuting election criminals. The more the Judges had to do with election trials the worse it was for the Judges and for the administration of justice. The whole Government were charged, and the Provincial Secretary could not be made a scapegoat.

### All Held Responsible.

If the charges were proved, the whole Government must resign, and it was most unfortunate that a Royal Commission should intervene and decide whether the Government should hold office or resign. (Hear, hear.) Seven men could be selected in the House who would give the accused as fair a trial as the Judges of the land. (Applause.) Had the sense of fairness so far disappeared that a man would not be dealt with fairly, though there was a political difference? The presumption that a Royal Commission should determine whether the hon. gentlemen should continue in office would be resented by the country at large. The provision in the commission that witnesses could not be excused from answering incriminating questions, but that the evidence could not be used in a subsequent criminal proceeding, was directly opposed to the provisions of the statute and contrary to the spirit of the resolution in the House of Commons in the McGreevy case, neither was there any authority under the statute for providing that charges against any other Minister should be made in writing. That clause should come out of the commission. The Royal Commission was a means of escape from some of the consequences of their terrible act. If not, what had they to fear from trial before any tribunal? There was no authority for asking the commission to decide such a case, and the Pacific scandal commission made no report, but only submitted the evidence. It was the right of the people to have such charges investigated before the great searchlight of Parliamentary inquiry, where nothing could escape.

### Mr. Clarke's Reproof.

Mr. Sam. Clarke (West Northumberland) congratulated Mr. Carscallen upon his speech, which, he said, was quite out of the ordinary. He could not say so much of all the hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. member for Manitoulin made his charges nearly every desk opposite was in danger of being broken by the fists of the hon. gentlemen as they applauded with glee. Were those plaudits fitting? Were these the men to whom we should look for an impartial hearing of